



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,966	12/23/2003	Patrick Willem	920522-95347	9399
23644	7590	11/14/2006		EXAMINER
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP P.O. BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			DINH, DUC Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/743,966	WILLEM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DUC Q. DINH	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-21 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/03/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the Response to the Requirement filed on September 06, 2006. Applicant's election with traverse for the ground(s) that claim 22 is depended on claim 1 are persuasive. Claims election of Group I, claims 1-11 and 22, is acknowledged.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogino et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,791,513), hereinafter Ogino.

In reference to claim 1, Ogino discloses in Figure 1, a tiled emissive display (100) for displaying an image, the tiled emissive display (100) comprising a plurality of emissive display tile assemblies (101) mechanically coupled together, and

a processing means (103 in Fig. 3) for performing real-time calculations with respect to the image to be displayed, wherein the processing means is a distributed processing means distributed over the plurality of emissive display tile assemblies (101), so that each emissive display tile assembly (101) is suitable for handling a different portion of the image for performing real-time calculations (see col. 7, lines 1-25).

In reference to claim 2, Ogino discloses the tiled emissive display (100) wherein the distributed processing means (103) is suitable for performing image upscaling or downscaling at each emissive display tile assembly (101) [col. 5, lines 40-46; col.7, lines 9-25].

In reference to claim 3, Ogino discloses for the image upscaling or downscaling a high-level scaling algorithm is used (col. 11, lines 10-19).

In reference to claim 4, Ogino discloses wherein the high-level scaling algorithm is a 100% accurate scaling algorithm (col. 5, lines 61-67; col. 9, line 64 – col. 10 line 36).

In reference to claim 5, Ogino discloses the distributed processing means of the plurality of emissive display tile assemblies (101) operate in parallel (see Fig. 2).

In reference to claim 6, Ogino discloses an emissive display tile assembly (100) is provided with a data input and/or a data output connection for receiving data from or transmitting data to another emissive display tile assembly (101) via any of a multi-line connection (see Figs. 2 and 3).

In reference to claim 7, Ogino discloses an emissive display tile assembly (101) is provided with a power input and/or a power output connection (106) for receiving power from or transmitting power to another emissive display tile assembly (101) via any of a multi-line connection (see Figs 2 and 3).

In reference to claim 9, Ogino discloses in each emissive display tile assembly (101) is provided with a local memory means (104) for storing configuration data (Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 20-25).

In reference to claim 11, Ogino discloses the tiled emissive display (100) has an adjustable size (col. 2, lines 30-35).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino.

In reference to claim 8, Ogino discloses an emissive display tile assembly (101) is provided with a signal transmit section 105 and power transmit section 106 but not suggest connector allowing to combine both power and data transmission.

However, absent a showing of critically and/or unexpected result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the circuit 105 and 106 of Ogino as desired as was judicially recognized with *In re Larson*, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), which recognizes that the combination of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter.

In reference to claim 10, Ogino does not teach an emissive display tile assembly (101) is adapted so that it can be repaired while the other tiles continue working. However, as shown in Fig. 6 a displaying of a character can be used 16 or 4 or 1 of unit(s) 101. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that each emissive display (101) can be adapted so that it can be repaired while other display continued working as claimed.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino view of Cok (U.S Patent No. 6,999,045).

In reference to claim 22, Ogino discloses the display is an LED display (see Figs. 2-3) but not the OLED display. Cok discloses a electronic system for tiled display using OLEDs display.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the OLED tiled displays in the system of Ogino as taught by Cok because it would provide high quality image tiled displays.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUC Q. DINH whose telephone number is (571) 272-7686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHARD HJERPE can be reached on (571)272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DUC Q DINH